

RYAN S. BENYAMIN, State Bar No. 322594
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
1900 Avenue of the Stars, 28th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (424) 446-6913
Facsimile: (866) 974-7329
rbenyamin@wsgr.com

JASON MOLLICK (*pro hac vice*)
JEREMY P. AUSTER (*pro hac vice*)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, New York 10019
Telephone: (212) 999-5800
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
jmollick@wsgr.com
jauster@wsgr.com

Counsel for Defendant Google LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 I, Jeremy P. Auster, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at the law firm of Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati, P.C., counsel
 3 for Defendant Google LLC (“Google”) in this action. I submit this Declaration pursuant to Civil
 4 Local Rule 6-3 and in support of Google’s Motion to Extend Time Pursuant to L.R. 6-3. I have
 5 personal knowledge of the facts and circumstances described below, and would testify to them if
 6 called upon as a witness.

7 2. On April 3, 2023, I emailed Plaintiff to ask if he would stipulate to an adjournment
 8 of Google’s deadline to oppose Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. 49, the
 9 “Motion”) until after Google’s pending Motion to Dismiss is heard. Plaintiff would not state
 10 whether or not he would consent to the adjournment. I sent two follow-up emails reiterating the
 11 request. Plaintiff did not answer those emails. *See* L.R. 6-3(2).

12 3. Google’s Motion to Dismiss, if granted, will render Plaintiff’s Motion completely
 13 moot. As such, Google should not be required to expend time and resources responding to
 14 Plaintiff’s Motion while the Motion to Dismiss is pending. The Motion to Dismiss is scheduled
 15 for hearing on **July 11**, and the Court has already continued the hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion until
 16 **August 8**. Dkts. 33, 50. Extending Google’s deadline to oppose the Motion until **July 17**, after
 17 the Motion to Dismiss is heard, will prevent undue burden and expense and promote judicial
 18 economy. *See* L.R. 6-3(1).

19 4. It would be harmful and prejudicial to force Google to expend unnecessary time
 20 and resources responding to Plaintiff’s frivolous “summary judgment” Motion that will be mooted
 21 if Google’s pending Motion to Dismiss is granted. Additionally, there will be no harm or prejudice
 22 to Plaintiff from Google’s requested extension. If Plaintiff’s copyright claim survives Google’s
 23 Motion to Dismiss, then Plaintiff’s Motion be fully briefed before the **August 8** hearing date and
 24 can remain on calendar. *See* L.R. 6-3(3).

25 5. This is Google’s first request for an extension of a briefing deadline in this case.
 26 On April 3, 2023, the Clerk issued a *sua sponte* notice continuing the hearing on Plaintiff’s Motion
 27 until August 8, 2023. Dkt. 50. Recognizing that Google’s Motion to Dismiss may dispose of the
 28 entire case, this Court also issued an Order on April 3, 2023 staying discovery pending the

1 resolution of Google’s Motion to Dismiss and adjourning the deadlines to file case management
2 statements and conduct the initial Case Management Conference until July 20, 2023 and July 27,
3 2023, respectively (*i.e.*, after the Motion to Dismiss hearing). Dkt. 47. *See* L.R. 6-3(5).

4 6. If Google's requested extension is granted, Google's opposition to Plaintiff's
5 Motion will be due **July 17, 2023** and Plaintiff's reply will be due **July 24, 2023**. L.R. 7-3(c).
6 The modification will not affect the **August 8** hearing date on Plaintiff's Motion, or any other
7 scheduled deadlines in this case. *See* L.R. 6-3(6).

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 5th
day of April, 2023 in New York, New York.

By: /s/ Jeremy P. Auster
Jeremy P. Auster